

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated July 15, 2005, claims 1-9 were rejected under §112, first paragraph because the Examiner stated the language added in the previous amendment, referring to the symbolic trapezoidal transfer function as being unchanging, was not described in the present specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

No rejection based on prior art was made in the July 15, 2005 Office Action. In the earlier Office Action dated May 17, 2004, claims 1-3 and 5-9 were rejected based on prior art references but, as noted in Applicants' response filed September 20, 2004 (page 5, third paragraph) no rejection of claim 4 on the merits was made, nor was there any statement that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and if the rejection under §112, of claim 4 (made in the May 17, 2004 Office Action) were overcome.

Since the absence of a prior art rejection of claim 4 was explicitly called to the attention of the Examiner in Applicants' previous response, and since the July 15, 2005 Office Action explicitly states that the rejection of claim 4 under §112, second paragraph is withdrawn, Applicants assume that claim 4 is allowable over the prior art of record.

The subject matter of claim 4 (which includes the subject matter of claims 2 and 3 as well) has therefore been embodied in independent claim 1, and claims 2, 3 and 4 have been cancelled. The reference to the symbolic trapezoidal transfer function being "unchanging" has been cancelled from claim 1, and therefore the rejection of claims 1-9 under §112, first paragraph is moot.

Since the present Amendment merely rewrites a claim in independent form, against which no prior art has ever been applied during prosecution of this application, the present Amendment does not raise any new issues requiring further searching or consideration, and entry of the present Amendment after the final rejection is therefore proper, and the same is respectfully requested.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested as well.

Submitted by,



(Reg. 28,982)

---

**SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP**  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312/258-5790  
Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 4385720.1